

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12053

tacular, and have rehearsed it with all the skill and cunning at their command.

When I say "financed," I mean exactly that. Let us not think for a moment that the funds for those supercolossal manifestations of hatred came from the coffers of the Japanese Communist Party. It is not that big; it is not that strong. It represents a miniscule minority of that country.

A report I have received from a very reliable source states that the hard core of the Communist demonstrators were paid \$1.65 a day—an unusually high labor wage. In this Chamber we have had debates about the pay rates of garment workers, clothing workers, and tailors in Japan, which are 14 or 15 cents an hour. But the people who engaged in the riots were paid in excess of the rate for a long, hard day's work—simply to run the streets, light the fires of revolt and keep them burning until the Communist objective was achieved. That is how the Kremlin and Peiping operate. That is how they keep boring into freedom, like worms boring into an apple. That is the raw technique of Communists—the use of a well-trained and well-rehearsed mob as a bludgeon to beat down the forces of orderly government, to create anarchy, on which the Communists thrive, and gain power.

Mr. President, anyone who seeks to make this administration a whipping boy for this tragic Japanese situation is closing his eyes to reality and closing his mind to the truth.

INSURANCE VANISHES WHEN MEDICAL CARE NEED IS GREATEST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many of our senior citizens have taken normal precautions for most of their lives against the devastating effects of high medical costs. The difficulty is that these very people find their hospital and surgical insurance canceled at the very time when they need it most.

Letter after letter from senior citizens of my State illustrate this problem. Illness is the handmaiden of old age. When our people most need medical care, they can least afford it; and insurance is either prohibitive or all but unobtainable.

The cost of medical care for the aged is 80 percent higher than the cost of medical care for the rest of the population, according to Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Eight out of 10 of the aged suffer from one or more chronic ailments, as compared with 4 out of 10 persons of all ages. More than one out of every four aged persons are affected by heart disease; while the aged make up less than 9 percent of the total population, they comprise 40 percent of all cases with heart trouble. The average hospital stay of older persons is two to three times longer than that of persons under 65. Many physical handicaps of the aged could have been prevented if the diseases or injuries had been treated promptly.

Mr. President, I have before me a typical letter in regard to this aspect of the

problem of medical care for our senior citizens. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to H.R. 4700 which would amend the Social Security Act to include hospital, nursing home, and surgical costs for persons covered by this act after retiring.

I am 64 years old and will have to retire next January 1961. I have paid on insurance since 1937 when the company took out group insurance, but 30 days after retiring this is all canceled. I will have to look for other insurance to cover hospital and surgical care because I can't afford to be without insurance after 65. Few retired people can afford the price the insurance company asks for protection. Therefore I am asking you to vote for this bill or any amendments which might be added and are favorable to the retired persons on social security.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, with Congress moving rapidly toward an early adjournment, there are certain legislative items that must be taken care of promptly and completely. No amount of pressure generated by the approaching national conventions and campaigns can be used as an excuse to justify overlooking these measures, or merely according them perfunctory treatment.

Among the issues which, in my opinion, must be decided is the question of the pending pay raise for postal workers and Federal employees under the Classification Act. Fortunately, in House bill 9883, the Senate now has under consideration an excellent measure that deserves the full support of this body.

I think all of us are now familiar with the general terms of this bill, so it will not be necessary to discuss them in any detail. It provides for a minimum 7½-percent increase in the salaries now being paid to postal and classified Federal employees and to certain other small categories of Government workers. All in all, the bill would be of benefit to approximately 1,570,000 civil servants and their families, at an annual cost of about \$697 million.

This is a great deal of money, and Congress should be sure of the merit of any legislation that commits the Government to expenditures of this size.

Money is important in the operations of the Federal Government, but the people who work for this Government are infinitely more important.

When the facts of this case are laid on the line, they present a compelling case for Congress to pass this proposed legislation.

If Federal employees are denied a raise which they have earned—and deserve—on the grounds that it is too expensive, an argument raised by some of its opponents, a great injustice will have been committed. This line of reasoning assumes, in effect, that there is nothing morally or economically wrong in expecting these employees to sub-

dize the functions of the Government. When put this bluntly, I do not think any of us will accept this argument.

An equally fallacious argument now being directed against this proposed legislation is that extensive comparative salary data now being collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics might be used as the basis for salary legislation by the next Congress.

It is further claimed that the Classification Act contains certain inequities and defects that are not corrected by House bill 9883.

It must be cold comfort to the hard-pressed Federal employees to know that statistical data on salaries are now being compiled and that they might lead to a pay raise next year. These employees deserve this increase; and because they have already earned it, they deserve it now. It will be simple enough at a later date to make any adjustments that might be desirable on the basis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics report.

As for the alleged defects and inequities in the Classification Act, nobody contends that it is a perfect piece of legislation. But is it the law that we have in hand to work with, and it has proved satisfactory and workable for 11 years.

The voices of dissent that have used these arguments miss the point. If a pay raise is justified now, it should be granted now, even though it means a slight increase in the budget. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics study suggests the need for new legislation, we can enact such legislation after these data have been presented to Congress. And why should urgently needed salary action be delayed now because the Classification Act may have some flaws in it? We have had more than a decade to amend this law as we saw fit. Surely that can be done at a later date.

The point—and the only point that carries any real weight—is that the postal, classified, and other groups of Government employees covered by House bill 9883 have earned a salary increase. They deserve it now, and they need it now.

Regardless of what future studies may show, there is available at this moment more than enough adequate, objective information to justify the immediate passage of this bill. Let me mention briefly some of these facts and some fundamental issues involved in the Government's overall personnel program and problems that are related to the enactment of this bill.

There can be no doubt about the fact that many civil servants are having a very difficult time in supplying their families with only the bare necessities of life. They are up against the very solid and irrefutable fact that living costs are now at an all-time high. They are up against the fact that Federal salaries have always lagged behind those of private industry. They are up against the fact that, although their productivity in recent years has kept pace with that of employees in private enterprise, their wage increases in many categories comparable in terms of function and responsibility have not.

This inequitable treatment goes beyond being just a hardship on those now working for the Government. It also intensifies the persistent problems involved in the recruitment and retention of the ablest people in the Federal service.

The Government must compete with the private sector of our economy for the most promising and competent people. When we consider the complexities of modern government and the perilous times we live in, the absolute necessity for having top-caliber personnel in the Government is so patently obvious that the point need not be labored.

Employees of the Post Office Department perform what may very well be the most important day-in and day-out service offered by this Government. They do their job well.

I am sure that all of us in Congress share my feeling, based on a great deal of contact, of heavy reliance and dependence upon the civil service in general. The work of these people is characterized by a deep sense of responsibility, conscientiousness, and a high level of professional skill.

As an employer, the Federal Government would not only be harsh and unjust, but also would be very shortsighted in a practical sense, if it failed to recognize these qualities and to reward them accordingly.

This recognition and the appropriate action are, in the initial and most important phase, the responsibility of Congress. The law prohibits Federal employees from presenting their case or fighting for their objectives with the techniques used by employees in private business. Civil servants cannot strike; nor can they bargain collectively in the usual meaning of this term.

This Congress has an inescapable obligation to the entire Federal service. We must face up to that obligation now.

I wish to remind the Members of this distinguished body that there is a special urgency in connection with our disposition of this bill. For reasons which, as I indicated earlier, seem to me to be wholly unsupportable, the Administration is apparently opposed to any pay increase at all. It seems most likely that any pay bill sent to the White House will be vetoed by the President.

In these circumstances, Congress must clear this bill rapidly, so that there will still be an opportunity to override the expected veto before the unusually early adjournment which everyone anticipates. If we delay action until such time as a pocket veto is possible, Congress will be powerless to attempt to override.

The reasons for the passage of this bill are persuasive. The obligation of Congress in this matter is clear and unmistakable. The circumstances under which this measure is being considered make speedy action on our part absolutely essential.

Let us, therefore, pass House bill 9883, and pass it now. To do this would be no more than doing our duty. To do less would be a dereliction of our duty and a breach of faith with every employee of the Government of the United States.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—PUBLICATION OF ITEMIZED BREAKDOWN OF ALL EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee has reported to the Senate H.R. 12232, the legislative appropriation bill. When this bill is brought up for consideration I shall offer an amendment, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the purpose of which will be to make mandatory the publication of an itemized breakdown of all expenditures, either in the form of appropriated dollars or in the form of foreign currencies, that are made by Members of Congress, congressional committees, or staff employees, while on official trips.

This amendment includes the publication of all expenditures made by individual Members, House and Senate committees, joint committees, committees on Interparliamentary Union, all other committees, and their staffs.

The amendment requires that each individual Member or employee of Congress shall furnish to the chairman of his committee an itemized report showing how much was spent and the purpose for which the expenditures were made.

The chairman of the committee will then have incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the consolidated reports of the committee, but included in this consolidated report will be an itemized breakdown showing the actual expenditures made by each individual Member or employee, along with the purpose for which such expenditures were made.

If a point of order is made on this amendment, which we admit constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, a motion will be made to suspend the rules. In order to comply with the rules of the Senate, the proper notification of this request for suspension has already been filed with the Senate, and appears on page 12040 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1930, along with a copy of the proposed amendment.

With the advance filing of this official notice, our amendment will be in order on this appropriation bill.

For the past several years we have been trying to get a bill passed which will require Members of Congress or congressional committees to render a public accounting of all expenditures of public funds that are made while on official trips, but while the Senate has on at least two occasions approved the amendment, we have been unsuccessful in getting it accepted by the House.

We recognize that, with the widespread commitments of our Government throughout the world, it is oftentimes necessary for Members of Congress to make official trips in order that their committees may more intelligently legislate, and we do not question that these trips made on official business should be paid for by the U.S. Government. However, we must not overlook the fact that it is the American taxpayers who are paying for these official trips, and they are en-

titled to a public accounting as to how their money is being spent.

H.R. 12232 is the appropriation bill which provides money to pay the salaries and other expenditures of the Members of Congress and the employees of the legislative branch, and there can be no more appropriate bill to which our amendment could be attached. We shall request a rollcall vote upon the Senate's adopting this proposal, and we hope that this time the House will accept the amendment.

However, should the House refuse to accept the amendment, and should it result in a deadlocked conference, it will only mean that we as Members of Congress and our employees will do without our pay until such time as we agree to render a public accounting of all our expenditures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not seen the amendment, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say I have not had a chance to study it in detail, but I have observed it in the RECORD and I had a conversation with the Senator about it. As I understand the amendment, it provides that any Member traveling at Government expense shall report that expense, what the amount is for, and the details for which the money has been spent, with the chairman of his committee, and the chairman of the committee shall then make the report available to the public. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I see no objection to that amendment. Is anyone objecting to it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The Senate, on at least two occasions, adopted it unanimously. At one time there was a rollcall vote which was 68 to 0. Of those absent, 26 indicated on the record they were for it, and not one was against it. Unfortunately, it was eliminated in conference. I am hoping this time the House will be more receptive to the proposal. I think the very least we can do is tell the American people and the taxpayers we are going to give them a public accounting of expenditures that are made on official trips.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Much of the criticism of the Members of the legislative branch of Government, and of the executive branch, is due to the sins of a few being passed on to the many. A public accounting of public money would not hurt anyone. I see no reason why anyone should oppose the amendment, which provides for a report showing the spending of how much money, for what purpose, in connection with an official mission, and the chairman of the committee making that information available to the general public.

Is that what the amendment does?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is it. I certainly appreciate the support of the Senator from Texas. I have talked with him previously. He feels, just as

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12055

strongly as I do, that the American taxpayers are entitled to an accounting of the expenditure of their money. That is what we are providing for in the amendment.

I am confident the cases of abuse are in the minority and that there are very few of them. However, regardless of how isolated they may be, expenditures in connection with our official travel will continue to give Members of Congress a black eye until we open to public examination an accounting of our expenditures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we do that, and the American taxpayers will review these records, they will find that a large part of the expenditures are proper.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the support of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall not make the request now, and may not make it at all, but I ask the minority leader and the Senator from Delaware to consider the possibility of bringing up the legislative appropriation bill, if there is no objection, so we can get it to conference. I ask them to take up the question with Senators who may be interested in it. I will discuss it with them later. I want them to give consideration to taking up that bill before the weekend.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Having fled this motion last night, we are protected under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall talk to the Senator before I make the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well.

SOUND MEDICAL PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the preparation and drafting of Senate bill 3503, the senior Senator from Michigan has done a service for the Congress and the American people as a whole.

It is my privilege to be a cosponsor of this reasonable and practical approach to meeting the medical needs of our elder citizens.

The Honorable James T. Blair, Jr., Governor of the great State of Missouri, has made a thoughtful analysis of the problem and of the constructive way in which S. 3503 would help meet it.

I was glad to receive a copy of Governor Blair's letter to Senator McNAMARA, as well as a copy of his analysis of this bill, and ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE OF MISSOURI,

Jefferson City, Mo., May 25, 1960.

Hon. PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: I appreciate very much the opportunity to send you my comments on S. 3503, which I consider to be an excellent bill, and one which I am sure

would prove to be a tremendous boon to all aged persons in this country. The passage of this bill would lift a constantly nagging worry from the minds of our retired aged, with respect to their medical and hospital care, and give them peace of mind in their declining years. I am extremely pleased to note that both of our great Senators from Missouri, THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., and STUART SYMINGTON, have joined you in sponsoring this bill.

I enclose my comments in relation to your questionnaire, which I hope will be of use to you in your efforts to obtain passage of S. 3503.

Very truly yours,

J. T. BLAIR, Jr.,
Governor.

COMMENTS IN ANSWER TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON
McNAMARA BILL, S. 3503

1. FINANCE

(a) The McNamara plan of financing through the social security system, plus supplementation from general revenues, is far preferable to administration plan of financing entirely from general revenues. The social security plan spreads the cost over all employed persons and their employers throughout their earning period, this being the time during which they are best able to contribute to such a fund. It uses the insurance principle of each person helping to pay for his own paid-up health care plan, available at retirement; this makes it something they have worked for, not a handout of someone's charity. The social security plan would make benefits available on a like basis to all retired persons throughout the Nation; not just in the wealthier States who would have the resources to be able to participate. Under the administration plan there would be some States with a full-scale program, but there might be others with no program, and a number where the benefits might be on every conceivable gradation of adequacy.

(b) Missouri could not possibly participate in the administration program without increasing State taxes.

(c) The legislature would, of course, have to determine the priorities among the various needed State services. It is very possible that the use of increased State tax revenues for a medical care plan such as is envisioned by the Eisenhower administration might make it impossible to expand or add other needed services, and could, dependent on action by the legislature, result in curtailment of present services.

2. ELIGIBILITY

The administration's proposal, which is nothing more than a major medical or catastrophic insurance plan, completely misses the crucial point at which the majority of aged in Missouri need help. It is the first \$250 or \$400 which causes our major concerns. To be fully protected, the aged person would have to carry Blue Cross or some commercial hospital insurance in addition to the administration's insurance proposal. Our experience shows that the majority of retired aged persons in this State (at least 60 percent having annual incomes of \$1,000 or less) are not able to carry Blue Cross or similar insurance. In many cases they would not be able to pay the first \$250 or \$400, and the result would be the same as it is in many cases now—the aged person would do without needed care, or would wait until the condition became acute and quite possibly too late for cure.

The McNamara proposal, providing initial benefits without deductible features, would be infinitely more effective in meeting actual health care needs of the aged.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

An evaluation of the medical care plans for public assistance recipients, as now op-

erated by each of the 50 States, will show a variation in scope and adequacy from zero to full and complete coverage. The same variations would undoubtedly exist under the administration's insurance proposal.

On the other hand a plan operated as your bill proposes will provide medical care for all aged persons; the care would be reasonably comparable whether the aged person lived in a rich State or in a poor State. In addition, there would not be the drastic change in plans or benefits when the aged person wished to move from one State to another.

4. THE MEANS TEST

(a) The means test is not a pleasant experience, and to many aged persons the idea is repugnant. From an administrative standpoint it is a very difficult task to try to make a fair and objective decision. If an income tax return would be used automatically without verification the task would not be particularly difficult; the problem then would be in the inequity which might be possible due to the great premium placed on having a low reporting of income. If an actual verification of income would be required, this would present a tremendous administrative problem in connection with the thousands of aged in Missouri who are not receiving public assistance.

(b) If actual verification of income is necessary, it would mean that a huge number of additional employees would have to be hired for this purpose.

5. THE PROBLEM OF COMPULSION

The administration proposal is voluntary only for these aged persons who are still employed, or for those who are in the upper income brackets. Much as those in the lower income brackets may want to have insurance coverage, they really have no choice when the available income does not decently provide for food, shelter, utilities, clothing, medicine, and the other absolute necessities of daily living. In Missouri the average OASI recipient receives about \$72 per month; the average OAA recipient receives about \$59 per month. The average person in these circumstances has no choice to make. If the voluntary plan is followed, those who are able to pay the cost of the premiums (and therefore the least needy) will be covered; those least able to pay the premiums (and therefore the most in need of such coverage) will not have coverage, and a full program of additional supplementation would continue to be necessary to cover this group.

6. COST TO THE STATES

(a) We believe the cost to the State for the first \$250 would be very high, but have no basis at present for making an estimate. As one indication, however, out of Missouri's 470,000 persons over age 65, about 116,000 are receiving old-age assistance. Using Mr. Flemming's figure of \$177 as the average annual expenditure of persons in this age group for health and medical expenses, it would cost the State \$20,532,000 for that group of aged presently receiving public assistance. During the past year the division of welfare has had only \$1 million in both Federal and State funds available for hospital care for all assistance programs.

(b) We have no way of estimating how many persons not now on old-age assistance would apply and be found eligible, due to a desire to qualify for medical care benefits.

7. OTHER COMMENTS

The administration plan requires the aged person to pay an extremely high proportion of his medical care costs after he has retired. This means that often he is unable to make payments, or payment is required at a time when he is least able to do so. The McNamara proposal, on the other hand, requires contribution from the person during his working days, when he is most able to make such payments.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Also, Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate the Walter Lippman column entitled "Medical Care for the Aged." With his customary objectivity, Mr. Lippman points out the soundness of the McNamara approach as compared with that of the President.

I ask unanimous consent that this analysis by Mr. Lippman, as it appeared in the Washington Post of June 16, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED
(By Walter Lippmann)

Almost everyone realizes that a great mass of the old people do not have the savings, and cannot depend upon their children to pay for the doctors, hospitals, nursing homes, and drugs which because they are aging, they need more than do younger people.

There are a few eccentrics, professing to be conservatives, who think that in a truly rugged individualism these ailing old people would do without medical care if they can't pay for it, or would make their children mortgage the future to pay the medical bills.

But the country is not that ruggedly obtuse to the facts of life, and accordingly both the administration and the Democratic opposition are agreed that the need, which is obvious and urgent, must be met by Government measures.

Thus, this administration has prepared a program which the director of the budget, Mr. Stans, says will cost \$1.5 billion by 1964 and \$2.5 billion by 1970. For the Democrats, Senator McNAMARA and some 19 Senators, including KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, and HUMPHREY, have introduced a bill that would add medical insurance to the existing old age insurance. After the first year, the cost of this program would be \$1.5 billion. Thus the two programs are approximately of the same size.

But between the two programs there is a basic issue of principle. On one side are the President and his advisers. On the other side are the preponderant mass of the Democrats and also a considerable minority of the Republicans led by Governor Rockefeller. They differ essentially on how the program shall be financed.

Shall it be financed by compulsory insurance, which means that throughout a person's working life he and his employer will be taxed to provide an insurance fund for his medical needs when he is retired and is no longer earning an income? This is the principle of the McNamara bill in the Senate, as it was of the Forand bill in the House, and it has the support of the leading Democrats and of Governor Rockefeller.

Or shall the program be financed, as the administration proposes, by charitable doles to the very poor, paid for out of compulsory taxes collected by the National and State Governments?

For reasons which he has never explained, the President regards compulsory social security taxes as unsound, socialistic, and rather un-American; on the other hand he regards compulsory taxes to pay for doles based on a means test as somehow more "voluntary," sounder, more worthy of a free society and more American.

Under the McNamara bill, medical insurance would be added to the existing old-age insurance system. During his working life, each person covered by the social security system would contribute an additional amount, as would also his employer, to supplement his retirement income to include medical services.

It is true that during the first few years benefits would be received by persons who had not contributed because the system did not exist when they were earning their living. These benefits would be paid for by the younger people. But as the younger people would be buying their own insurance, there is little inequity in this. Nobody will lose anything, although those who are already too old to have been contributors to an insurance plan will benefit. In a few years everyone receiving the benefits will have paid his share.

Why does the President feel so strongly opposed to the principle of compulsory insurance for medical care to supplement the insurance, which already exists, for old age? What is wrong about its being compulsory that a man should insure himself against the needs of his old age? What is so wonderful about a voluntary system under which a man who doesn't save for his old age has to have his doctors and his hospital bills paid for by his children or public welfare funds? There is nothing un-American in the principle that the imprudent shall be compelled to save so that they do not become a burden to their families and the local charities, so that they can meet the needs of their old age with the self-respect which comes from being entitled to the benefits because they have paid the cost out of their own earnings.

The President has been led to think, he says, that compulsory insurance is "a very definite step in socialized medicine." Why? In a system of compulsory insurance the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would administer the program, could and should use as its agents private organizations like the National Blue Cross Association in negotiating with hospitals and nursing homes and in dealing with claims and complaints. The system would be financed as insurance. But it would be worked not by a new Government agency but by the kind of private voluntary association which the President otherwise believes in.

In this connection it is interesting to remember that in the early 1930's when voluntary health insurance plans were inaugurated, our old friend, the American Medical Association, was declaring that they were communism and socialism and socialized medicine. Today, the American Medical Association is pointing to these same voluntary insurance plans as the solution of our present needs and the proper alternative to compulsory old age medical care insurance.

Among the opponents of medical insurance there seems to be a vague and uncomfortable feeling that it is a newfangled theory, alien to the American way of life and imported, presumably, from Soviet Russia.

The Founding Fathers were not subject to such theoretical hobgoblins. In 1798 Congress set up the first medical insurance scheme under the U.S. Marine Hospital Service. The scheme was financed by deducting from seamen's wages contributions to pay for their hospital expenses.

If that was socialized medicine, the generation of the Founding Fathers was blandly unaware of it.

**CITATION OF HUMBLE REFINING CO.
FOR EXCELLENCE OF STANDARDS
IN OPERATION**

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is particularly gratifying when a leading American industrial organization furnishes proof of the excellence of its standards in operation. Such a distinction has just been achieved by the Esso Standard Division of Humble Oil & Refining Co., as evidenced by an award

of the Special Citation of the Public Health Service. Particularly noteworthy is this recognition because Esso received the award for the fourth time, and the third consecutive year.

The Special Citation represents one of the Government's top awards for excellence in sanitation, and was presented to John D. Rogers, General Manager of the Esso Standard Division, by Wesley E. Gilbertson, Chief, Division of Engineering Services of the Public Health Service, at a ceremony in the New York Yacht Club, New York City, on Tuesday, June 7, 1960.

Mr. Rogers, who, in addition to other important connections, is a member of the Board of Directors of the American Merchant Marine Institute, has long since demonstrated his interest in elevating standards connected with the maritime industry. His fellow members of the Esso Standard Division have combined their efforts successfully in achieving the most desired results. How well they have acquitted themselves is demonstrated by the fact that each of the 39 tankers of the Esso Standard Division achieved a rating of 95 or higher on an official PHS inspection involving 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance.

The previous citations to the Esso Standard Division were awarded in September 1955, June 1958, and March 1959.

Tankers of Esso call at all Atlantic and gulf coast ports and at river ports along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been reading with great interest a lecture on "The Philosophy of Communism" delivered at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., by the Reverend Francis J. Conklin, S.J.

Father Conklin's lecture is so illuminating that I believe it should be brought to the attention of all Members of the Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have been read and reread, quoted and misquoted, understood and misunderstood for over a century. In this series of lectures we hope to provide the student with a background so that the works of Marx and Engels may be read with understanding. There is no substitute for direct contact with these original works. But this reading may be facilitated by a knowledge of the context in which the writing was done. Our purpose is to supply footnotes, so that the student will not have to stop every few minutes and seek a point of reference.

During the course of these lectures our main emphasis will be upon Karl Marx because Marx is more difficult to understand and once Marx is understood, Engels is quite easy to grasp. By reading their works you will ascertain what Marx and Engels said. So far as is humanly possible we want you to know why they said what they did say. To understand why we must try to create for ourselves the context of the times in which they spoke. We must endeavor to understand the political, economic and social conditions that existed during the 19th cen-